



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,511	10/07/2003	Christian Wietfeld	449122059500	8412
29177	7590	11/28/2007	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP			AFSHAR, KAMRAN	
P.O. BOX 1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60690			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/679,511 	WIETFELD, CHRISTIAN
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kamran Afshar 571-272-7796	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/09/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

#### **For Example:**

Page 3, Line 14, recites word(s), "triggers can also be set **an** any later point". It should be changed to " triggers can also be set **at** any later point".

Page 4, Line 19, recites word(s), "**SA**" which should be clearly defined or deleted.

Page 4, Line 21, recites word(s), "**SB**" which should be clearly defined or deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 7, page 6, line1 recites word(s), "**a first database**" which should changed to "**the first database**".

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan (U.S. Pub. No.: 2002/0187775 A1) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,882,718 B1).

With respect to claim 1, Corrigan teaches a method for creating or changing (See Corrigan e.g. service creation (or installation or implementation) as shown in Fig. 2) subscriber-related (See Corrigan e.g. Self-provisioning, creating a subscriber home page defining the personalized service, Page 2, ¶ [0032]-[0033]) entries in a first database of a service (See Corrigan e.g. portal comprises a customer care provisioning interface and a provisioning database (or 1<sup>st</sup> database), the interface allowing network

Art Unit: 2617

operator personnel to access the database (or 1<sup>st</sup> database) for inputting and updating operator-specific provisioning data for subscribers, Page 2, ¶ [0036]) that is implemented via HTTP (See Corrigan e.g. HTTP, Page 2, ¶ [0051] and as shown in Fig. 2), comprising: [activating a previously implemented trigger] on the basis of an HTTP proxy platform (See Corrigan e.g. WAP proxy, Page 3, Line 5 of ¶ [0073], HTTP interface (or platform), Page 4, Lines 1-3 of ¶ [0120], and also see URLs is used to create service, Page 7, Lines 6-7 of ¶ [0183]) when the service is called (See Corrigan e.g. call handling and setting up the call, Page 7, Lines 9-10 of ¶ [0181]); calling user-entered service-related (See Corrigan e.g. subscriber can create (or select), define the services to which they have subscribed i.e. regularly visited URLs, email address, news services, etc., Page 3, Lines 4-8 of ¶ [0070] and subscriber-related data (See Corrigan e.g. data for subscriber i.e. name, address, etc., Page 3, Lines 1-7 of ¶ [0073]) from a second database (See Corrigan e.g. subscriber database (or 2<sup>nd</sup> database), subscriber / Bulk provisioning database (or 1<sup>st</sup> database) as shown in Fig. 2), the user-entered service-related and subscriber-related data being created or changed in the first database (See Corrigan e.g. Page 2, ¶ [0036]); and [deactivating the trigger] in the platform after installation is complete on a subscriber-related basis (See Corrigan e.g. entries are stored in the provisioning database which makes it obvious that the process of creating, updating, modifying completed, Page 3, Lines 7-8 of ¶ [0073], also See Page 3, Lines 5-8 of ¶ [0077]). However, Corrigan does not explicitly teach activating a previously implemented trigger and deactivating the trigger. In an analogous field of endeavor, Smith teaches real time customer service data manipulation to allow multiple services per trigger type (See Smith Co. 1, Lines 7-9) first and second database (See Smith e.g. 212, 210 of Figs. 1-2, and 210, 2112, 2116 of Fig. 3) via HTTP protocol (See Smith e.g. Co. 9, Lines 37-39). Further, Smith makes obvious the concept of activating a previously implemented trigger and deactivating the trigger (See Smith e.g. implement originate triggers for processing call(s), terminating triggers, activate or deactivate, Co. 7, Lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching of Smith to Corrigan to implement commands (or triggers) to activate or deactivate certain features, or to otherwise modify a subscriber call management profile so that the existing (or old) service can be

Art Unit: 2617

maintained while a new service is installed without the loss of the revenue as suggested (See Smith e.g. Co. 1, Lines 51-58 and Co. 7, Lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 2, it is obvious that the first database is a local database is a central customer database, in which subscriber-related data of a number of services is stored (See Corrigan e.g. subscriber / Bulk provisioning database (or 1<sup>st</sup> database) as shown in Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 4, it is obvious that accessing a URL assigned to a particular service is evaluated as a call to the service (See Corrigan e.g. WAP proxy, Page 3, Line 5 of ¶ [0073], HTTP interface (or platform), Page 4, Lines 1-3 of ¶ [0120], and also see URLs is used to create service, Page 7, Lines 6-7 of ¶ [0183] and Smith e.g. Co. 11, URL co. 8, Line 6, multiple services, Co. 11, Lines 53-55).

Regarding claim 6, it is obvious the service involved is a service provided by a GSM network (See Corrigan e.g. (See Corrigan e.g. Deliver services optimally over various bearers for example Circuit switched Data, SMS, Cell Broadcast, GSM, Page 1, ¶ [0013], GSM network, Page, Lines 9-10 of ¶ [0178, And Smith e.g. GSM network, Co. 4, Lines 45-45-48).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan, Smith and further in view of Dizdarevic (U.S. Patent 7,257,401 B1).

Regarding claim 3, Corrigan and Smith teach everything as discussed above in the rejected claim 1, However, Corrigan and Smith do not explicitly teach that the first and second database are local databases of a first and second service, whereby the subscriber is migrated from the second to the first service. In an analogous field of endeavor, Dizdarevic teaches the concept of the first and second database (See Dizdarevic e.g. GSM HLR (or 1<sup>st</sup> database), TDMA HLR (or 2<sup>nd</sup> database) of Fig. 6) are local databases of a first and second service (See Dizdarevic e.g. GSM HLR and TDMA HLR are obviously local to the GSM service and TDMA service as shown in Fig. 6), whereby the subscriber is migrated from the second to the first service (See Dizdarevic e.g. migrating subscription profile from TDMA network to GSM network, Co. 9, Lines 25-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching of Dizdarevic to Corrigan and Smith to provide an improved methods or system of migrating subscribers (or subscription profile) from one network standard (or service provider) to another network standard (or another service

Art Unit: 2617

provider) for sending, or "originate," and to receive, or "terminate," messages regardless of whether the communications device is operating in a GSM communications network, a TDMA communications network, or a CDMA communications network as suggested (See Dizdarevic e.g. Co. 2, Lines 13-4 and Lines 32-36).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan, Smith and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Regarding claim 5, Corrigan and Smith teach everything as discussed above in the rejected claim 1. However, Corrigan and Smith do not explicitly teach that data originating from a subscriber dialog is incorporated into the creation or modification of the service-related and subscriber-related data. Further, Corrigan teaches self-provisioning (known as subscriber or user dialog) (See Corrigan e.g. self-provisioning, Page 2, Line 2 of ¶ [0032]), data originating from a subscriber (See Corrigan e.g. user is entering or inputting or creating, Page 3, Lines 4-8 of ¶ [0070]), the creation or modification of the service-related and subscriber-related data (See Corrigan e.g. Page 3, Lines 4-8 of ¶ [0070] and Lines 1-4 of ¶ [0072]). In an analogous field of endeavor, APA teaches that a subscriber dialog is incorporated into the creation or modification of data record in the database (See APA Page 2, Lines 11-13) via user-controlled dialog, which is known as self-provisioning. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching APA to Corrigan and Smith to a user / subscriber for using a well known method of self-provisioning (i.e. subscriber or user dialog) for data entry by themselves to activate or deactivate certain features, or to otherwise modify a subscriber call management profile so that the existing (or old) service can be maintained while a new service is installed without the loss of the revenue as suggested (See Smith e.g. Co. 1, Lines 51-58 and Co. 7, Lines 1-3).

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan (U.S. Pub. No.: 2002/0187775 A1) in view of Laurila (U.S. Pub. N.: 2002/0116384 A1).

With respect to claim 7, Corrigan teaches a system for creating or changing (See Corrigan e.g. service creation (or installation or implementation) as shown in Fig. 2) subscriber-related (See Corrigan e.g. Self-provisioning, creating a subscriber home page defining the personalized service, Page 2, ¶

Art Unit: 2617

[0032]-[0033]) entries in a first database of a service (See Corrigan e.g. Service DB as shown in Fig. 2), Also See i.e. comprises a server and various databases, Page 2, lines 1-2 of ¶ [0051]) that is implemented via HTTP (See Corrigan e.g. HTTP, Page 2, ¶ [0051] and as shown in Fig. 2 WAP proxy, Page 3, Line 5 of ¶ [0073]) comprising: a first database (See Corrigan e.g. provisioning DB as shown in Fig. 2) which is assigned to an HTTP service platform (See Corrigan e.g. HTTP interface (or platform), Page 4, Lines 1-3 of ¶ [0120], and also see URLs is used to create service, Page 7, Lines 6-7 of ¶ [0183]); a second database (See Corrigan e.g. subscriber DB as shown in Fig. 2); a provisioning server (See Corrigan e.g. server, Page 2, Lines 1-2 of [0049]) working in conjunction with the first and second database (See Corrigan e.g. communication with both subscriber DB and Service DB as shown in Fig. 2) for installation of service and subscriber-related entries into the first database (See Corrigan e.g. Page 2, ¶ [0036]). Further, Corrigan teaches working in conjunction with the provisioning server (See Corrigan e.g. server, Page 2, Lines 1-2 of [0049]) to install or modify the entries in the first database (See Corrigan e.g. Service DB as shown in Fig. 2). However, Corrigan does not explicitly teach on the basis of data originating from the second database; and an HTTP proxy connected upstream from an HTTP Client of the HTTP service platform. In an analogous field of endeavor, Laurila teaches utilization of subscriber DATA in a telecommunications system (See Laurila e.g. Page 1, Lines 1-2) and first and second database (See Laurila e.g. DB, DB2 DBNW of Fig. 3, Page, 3, Lines 13-4 and 18-19 of ¶ [0041]). Further, Laurila teaches concept of on the basis of data originating from the second database (See Laurila e.g. subscriber data originate from a subscriber database, Page 2, Lines 10-12 of ¶ [0021], Also see, MS can be connected on the bases of MSIDN to the subscriber DB via DBNW (or DataBase Network), Page 6, Lines 11-5 of ¶ [0065]) and an HTTP proxy connected upstream from an HTTP Client of the HTTP service platform (See Laurila e.g. service request, WAP connection which is upstream connection from MS to DB of Fig. 5, DBNW DB update step pf Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching of Laurila to Corrigan to method and or a system for subscriber databases in use and in an activated state, information about the subscriber database to be used is preferably transmitted to the serving network when a service is activated and / or updated DBNW As suggested (See Laurila e.g. Page 7, Lines 6-8)

Art Unit: 2617

so that to activate or deactivate certain features, or to otherwise modify a subscriber call management profile so that the existing (or old) service can be maintained while a new service is installed without the loss of the revenue.

***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- a) Chen (U.S. Pub. No.: 2003/0054810 A1).
  - b) Sladek (U.S. 7,043,241 B1).
  - c) Frost (U.S. 6,304,647 B1).
  - d) Border (U.S. 6,795,848 B1).
  - e) Marran (U.S. 6,549,770 B1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kamran Afshar whose telephone number is (571) 272-7796. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by the telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eng, George can be reached @ (571) 272-3984. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kamran Afshar